

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
June 17, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on June 17, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Report on Progress of the Evaluation Plan for Historic-Era Sites
Attachment 4	Cultural Resource Action Worksheet
Attachment 5	Cultural Resource Goals and Resource Actions
Attachment 6	Resource Action Identification Form – Foreman Creek – Relocate Car-Top Boat Ramp (C001) – DRAFT
Attachment 7	Resource Action Identification Form – Foreman Creek – Site Stabilization (C002) – DRAFT
Attachment 8	Resource Action Identification Form – Enterprise – Boat Ramp Extension (C003) – DRAFT
Attachment 9	Resource Action Identification Form – Signage Program – Cultural Resources (C004) – DRAFT
Attachment 10	Preliminary Cultural Resources Work Group Roster

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – May 13, 2003 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the May 2003 CRWG meeting is posted on the Oroville Facilities Relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C48: Send Cultural Resources Inventory Work Plan document to Juanita Anglin.
Status: DWR staff sent Ms. Anglin the Work Plan document.

Action Item #C49: Consolidate Resource Actions to eliminate redundancies and group according to goals.
Status: This action item will be covered under agenda item VI (see discussion below).

Study Plan Implementation Update

Janis Offermann, Cultural Resources Area Manager for DWR provided an update on Study Plan C1. She informed the group that crews were in the field for five weeks surveying approximately 2,300 acres, including all developed recreation areas. She explained that these areas were targeted for survey in Study Plan C1 and that these are areas where additional development is expected to occur. She informed the CRWG that 169 new sites have been identified, with 151 of those being historic, 16 prehistoric, and 2 multiple component sites. She

explained that 12 new components of previously recorded sites have been identified. She added that the researchers would go back and record some of the historic and prehistoric sites. One participant asked whether any correlation had been made between sites and names included in some of the literature. Janis responded that those correlations have not yet been explored; however, these issues will be reviewed in the future.

Historic-Era Evaluation Program

Adrian Praetzellis with Sonoma State University (SSU) gave a presentation on the proposed evaluation of historic-era sites and distributed a handout outlining the evaluation process (see Attachment 3). He reviewed FERC's legal responsibility under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and he explained what defines a historic property. He described where we are in the process and the development of separate evaluation plans for prehistoric and historic-era sites. He added that the plan will call for no excavation and collection of historic-era artifacts only if the item is in danger of being stolen or it is particularly useful for display and may be difficult to find again. Adrian showed the CRWG slides of sample historic sites within the project area, emphasizing the various historic themes represented at Lake Oroville.

Adrian put forth a proposal to study a sample of historic-era sites in various locations within the project area, namely a sample of approximately 60 sites representing historic themes in the project area (e.g. mining, farming, transportation, etc.). He said approximately half the selected sites will be in the fluctuation zone and the other half above the maximum reservoir pool.

One participant asked for clarification of California State University, Sacramento's role in the evaluation of sites within the project boundary. Janis Offermann responded that Sacramento would be focusing on prehistoric sites. She reminded the group that the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has a large say in the process and will review the evaluation plan. Art Angle suggested that all preliminary drafts need to go to the Tribes at the same time they are sent to DWR. Adrian said that a draft would be reviewed by DWR for quality control and then distributed to the tribes and others for formal content review.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

Janis Offermann provided an update since the usual reporter was not at the last Maidu Advisory Council meeting. She informed the CRWG of a discussion of resource actions and how the Council might want to develop resource actions separate from the CRWG. She asked participants to think about resource actions that are important to the Tribes and might not come up in the CRWG meetings. She also reported that the Council talked about potential development in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) and the possibility of impacting some sites. The Council discussed which sites may be involved and how to determine the potential importance of those sites. She added that the Council asked Michael Delacorte to develop an outline to assist with that task.

Resource Action Discussion

The Facilitator informed the CRWG that Francis Kelley had recently undergone surgery but had completed a Resource Action Identification Form for the restoration of historic springs. The form was submitted to Janis Offermann.

Steve Heipel with the consulting team distributed a Cultural Resource Action Worksheet (Attachment 4) and explained that the goal of the worksheet was to put information into a logical framework. He further pointed out that the shaded bars on the form include cultural resource goals previously approved by the CRWG. The CRWG was asked to review the resource goals and ensure that everyone supports them. The Facilitator added that the overarching goal is to match

each specific resource action proposal to the resource goal it supports. The basic organization and content of the Cultural Resource Action Worksheet were reviewed and discussed, with agreed-upon revisions captured electronically during the meeting.

Art Angle mentioned that his Tribal Council has identified some mitigation efforts that would become PM&E proposals. He asked if the process the CRWG was undertaking would be wasted, as the Tribes would make the final decision. The Facilitator suggested that the Tribes submit their resource action proposals as soon as possible and participate in the discussions within the collaborative. Art said the Tribes would likely have resource action proposals developed within a couple of months and may suggest removing recreation areas from State control. He went on to say that after protection measures were in place, the Tribes could consider issuing permits for recreation use. Steve Heipel added that the more actions the collaborative parties have an understanding of, the better for all concerned.

One participant asked whether any of the historic mining sites are possibly eligible for the National Register. Adrian responded that many may be eligible for listing.

Steve Heipel distributed, and the CRWG discussed, the Cultural Resource Goals and Resource Actions (Attachment 5). He explained that the goal statements from the Cultural Resource Action Worksheet have been included in these tables and the objective is now to provide additional resource actions to fit those goals. One participant asked if Foreman Creek must be accessible to the public. Steve responded that the law did not require it; however, the area lends itself to recreational use and is very popular.

One participant asked about handicap accessibility in recreation areas. The Facilitator responded that an Americans with Disabilities Act study to evaluate handicap accessibility at project facilities is being conducted within the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. One participant suggested that Oroville should have some type of California Welcome Center. Ellen Clark, representing Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), informed the CRWG that there are only two official welcome centers in the state. The Facilitator noted that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group has a proposed resource action that includes a visitors' center located near Highway 70 and the Feather River, closer to downtown Oroville.

The CRWG reviewed each of the resource goals and discussed potential resource actions that may help meet those goals. The proposed actions were captured electronically for tracking and later distribution.

DWR distributed copies of four draft Resource Action Identification Forms (Attachments 6 through 9) that had been previously prepared and offered to complete forms for some of the suggested resource actions on the list. Other participants (Ellen Clark, Brandy Doering, Michael Jablonowski, Patti Kroen, Patsy Seek and Adrian Smith) volunteered to prepare forms for other resource actions. DWR will distribute blank forms for participant use. The CRWG will discuss completed forms at the next CRWG meeting.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The Facilitator explained that in accordance with the Process Protocols, the Plenary Group has requested the preparation of rosters to identify participants in the various work groups and the Plenary Group. The Facilitator distributed copies of a preliminary Cultural Resources Work Group roster (Attachment 10). The roster includes participant name, primary and alternate representative for the participant, contact information for the primary representative, and the ultimate decision-making authority for the participant. The Facilitator requested feedback and revisions on the roster from the CRWG by the next work group meeting.

The Facilitator announced that the next CRWG meeting would be:

Date: July 22, 2003

Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.

Location: To be determined

Action Items

The following action items identified by the CRWG include a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #50: Distribute blank Resource Action Identification Forms to CRWG participants.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: July 7, 2003

Action Item #51: Complete Resource Action Identification Forms for resource actions as assigned.

Responsible: DWR/CRWG participants

Due Date: July 22, 2003

Action Item #52: Review Cultural Resources Work Group Roster and provide revisions and corrections to Facilitator.

Responsible: CRWG participants

Due Date: July 22, 2003

=